

### REMARKS

This amendment responds to the Office Action mailed February 26, 2007. In the Office Action the Examiner:

- rejected claims 12-17, 40-48 and 50-55 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Meyerzon et al. (US 6,547,829);
- rejected claims 18-20, 37-39 and 56-58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerzon et al. (US 6,547,829) in view of Rujan et al. (US 6,976,207); and
- rejected claim 49 under 37 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyerzon et al. (US 6,547,829) in view of Lambert et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0038350).

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 12-20, 37-40 and 42-58. Claims 46 and 58 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for all claim terms. Independent claims 12, 18, 37, 40, 50, and 56 have been amended to positively recite the claim limitations in response to the Examiner's comments on page 14 of the Office Action. For completeness, Applicant's arguments from the amendment of November 22, 2006 regarding the applicability of Myerzon, Lambert, and Rujan to the amended claims are repeated below.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

The Examiner has rejected claims 12-17, 40-48 and 50-55 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Meyerzon*. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse.

*Meyerzon* teaches a "first URL wins" methodology for resolving duplicate web pages. That is, the first time a specific document is encountered, it is filtered and indexed with the URL where it was found. See steps S21 – S25 in Figure 3 and Column 9, lines 32 – 50. If the same document is encountered again at another URL, this new URL is noted in history, but is not indexed. See steps S21 and S26 and Column 9, lines 32 – 40.

Applicants, however, teach a method where the URL that "wins" depends on the rank or score of the URL together with a hysteresis test. That is, when a crawled document has been encountered previously, the new copy of the document may become the "canonical" representative if it has a better rank and the rank is sufficiently better to justify a switch. When there is a switch to a new representative document, the new document is indexed. Applicants have amended the claims to clarify this point.

The amendments are supported by at least paragraphs [0048] (“This representative page is called the canonical page of its equivalence class...”) and [0069] (“each time a canonical page is replaced, the new canonical page is indexed”).

*Meyerzon* therefore does not teach  
instructions for indexing the representative document when said representative document is the newly crawled document; and  
instructions for repeating the receiving, reading, updating, determining and indexing operations with respect to a plurality of newly crawled documents, each of which shares a respective document identifier with a respective set of documents, such that at least some of the newly crawled documents are determined to be representative documents and are indexed.

For at least this reason claim 12 is not anticipated by *Meyerzon*. Further, claims 13-17, 40, 42-58, and 50-55 all have these limitations, so all of these claims are patentable over *Meyerzon*.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner has rejected claims 18-20, 37-39 and 56-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Meyerzon* in view of *Rujan*, and has rejected claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Meyerzon* in view of *Lambert*.

The same claim limitations addressed above for the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 appear in all of the claims here as well, and *Meyerzon* does not support these limitations. Further, neither *Rujan* nor *Lambert* fills in this missing element. These references address only document classification and “enhanced web page delivery,” and not a methodology for selecting a representative document.

Therefore, claims 18-20, 37-39, and 56-58 are all patentable over *Meyerzon*, *Rujan*, and *Lambert* in any combination.

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the amendments to the claims, and the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-4000 should any issues remain unresolved.

Date: May 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Gary S. Williams

31,066

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

2 Palo Alto Square

3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700

Palo Alto, California 94306

(650) 843-4000